

## Followers of Christ

PATRICK CARDINAL HAYES

An address delivered on Sunday, October 17, 1925, at the blessing of the "Shealy Memorial Building," Mount Manresa, Staten Island, New York.

**V**ERY REVEREND FATHER PROVINCIAL, Reverend Fathers, and my dear followers of Christ—for such you are—your very presence here indicates that. A moment ago, Father Provincial said to me, "It is very good of you to come here today." I said: "It is very good for me to be here. It is good for the Church that I came." It is a splendid thing for the Church and for the salvation of souls; for the very stability and foundation and perpetuity of the Church in America; in our own Archdiocese and out here along the Atlantic seaboard, and right out to the Pacific, and from the Lakes to the Gulf, that men of your type should foregather here in a place of this kind in order to sit down awhile and talk with our Lord. And therefore, I am here by my presence and in this elementary benediction of the new building to let you know, and to let the entire diocese know, let the entire country know how deeply interested I am in a movement of this kind. It is difficult for me to make men like you realize, standing where you are, and where I am, in my position—to make you realize how my heart feels toward a group of men like you and others who came here in order that they may know our Lord better—yea, that they may love him better, and knowing and loving Him better you might serve Him better. That is a one simple thought that I am sure is in your mind. It is your desire to get closer to our Lord and for our Lord to come closer to you, and then when you go back to your home and your business, to your professional life, you may radiate Christ, radiate His presence, radiate His spirit, radiate His doctrine, radiate His principles. And oh, my dear men, when I see men like you, men in such positions as you occupy, both high and low, I cannot tell you how you encourage and rejoice the heart of a shepherd. We are gravely and sometimes I might

say sadly disturbed and anxious about our good women, especially about our young women. There has within a short time been a radical and revolutionary upset of principles and of outlook on life that have eaten into the very home and that have desecrated the fireside, and are still menacing the very foundations of our society, civil, political, social and moral. The Church of God is really praying most earnestly that our good women may be saved from the disaster that is impending. Alongside of that there is that most promising sign of the times and that is that men are coming back to the altar; they are seen not only at Mass on Sunday but on weekdays. They go to the Sacraments not merely once a year or twice a year, but they go monthly, and weekly, and even some go daily to sit down at the banquet table of our Lord. When our men realize their opportunities and their duties in that direction it means nothing else but our salvation, it means the greater glory of God, better citizenship, truer Americanism.

And you may little dream how much when you come here you are contributing to the welfare of the Church and the state and the individual homes. So we rejoice and every Bishop's heart is warm when we find men, I repeat, like you to come and sit down and stay a little while and listen to the call of the Master—to come and walk with him and talk with him and think it all over. I was talking to a layman yesterday about 15 minutes. Little did he dream what a lesson he had taught his Archbishop. I was profoundly moved and impressed with what he said and the spirit in which he said it. I said when he left my house, "Thank God we have men of that type." That is the kind of man that you produce at Mount Manresa, at any rate he vindicated his spirit. I was talking about men who go to Church on weekdays. He said very simply: "Oh what a difference it makes in my life when day after day I realize my privilege to come into the presence of Christ, to kneel down at the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass and partake of the Bread of Angels. I never kneel down at Holy Mass without feeling my heart thumping and throbbing within my bosom. The scenes

of Calvary come back to me again; Calvary is real to me as it was 2000 years ago and I try to carry that spirit into my busy life and I cannot tell you how comforting and strengthening and inspiring it is with all."

My dear men that is your spirit, that is what happens to you when you come to a place of this kind, consecrated for you and for your own sanctification. Remember the Society of Jesus can ill afford to spare its good men, its very best men, and when the Superior of this Society will send down here as they have repeatedly done one after another, men of superior talent, men of rare experience, and for what purpose? In order that they may teach you and give you of their experience and of their wisdom and of their piety, and of their philosophy and of their theology. You ought to realize the sacrifice they make and it is all for you and indicates to you in turn how important this movement is. Therefore I rejoice to come here today. I rejoice to think that here at Mount Manresa the buildings are going up indicating the permanent foundation of the work. I thank you one and all and particularly you pioneers or I perhaps might say veterans, in coming to the support of a movement of this kind. In the name of God, in the name of Christ, our Lord, and for all that He stands for and represents, for the sake of our home, for the sake of our professional and business life, for the sake of homes in general and for the sake of our own dearly beloved land—for the sake of Holy Mother Church, I beg of each one of you to stand loyally by the Fathers so that this movement is not only bound to make greater success than it has at present, but that it may please God, flourish and reach out to men without number, that they may come here and kneel at the feet of Christ and realize what it is to walk with Him, to go with Him and so may give Him a sanctuary in this world. My dear men Christ has been driven out of every department of human life. There is no room, no welcome for Him in places where he should be most welcome, and where He is most needed, where His Gospel is needed—He has been driven back. Whither must He go? He comes back to dear Mother

Church and what a wonderful thing it is that you are to give Him a welcome with all your hearts and with all your minds and souls. Oh, my dear men, give Christ our Lord a place in your hearts—give him a big place in your lives, bring Him closer to you that you may receive His benediction. May God bless you, and maybe you feel that you have been complimented and are happy that I came, but no one could be more happy than I am at this moment as I have watched the progress of this work and realize the type of men supporting it, and encouraging the good Fathers of the Society of Jesus.

The retreat movement for laymen was organized at Fordham, N. Y., in 1909, by the late Rev. Terence J. Shealy, S.J. After his death he was succeeded at Mt. Manresa by Rev. Daniel J. Quinn, S.J., who is now in charge of retreats. During the past year the number of retreatants who have visited the Retreat House has been the largest in its history. A new heating plant has been installed for the comfort of visitors and forty-five additional rooms have been added. Over \$80,000 has been subscribed by those who have been active in this movement. The total cost of the new dormitory will be \$125,000, a sum which the friends of Father Shealy intend to raise by subscription.

S  
g  
t  
w  
C  
v  
or  
ab  
re  
ac  
su  
ve  
So  
bas  
ind  
acc  
ove  
inst  
divi  
I ha  
Hall

## Reunion and the Papacy

REV. FRANCIS WOODLOCK, S.J.

*Reprinted from the "Catholic Times."*

**L**AST month, by order of Our Holy Father the Pope, nearly thirty million members of the Apostleship of Prayer were appealed to through the fifty-three *Messengers of the Sacred Heart* which are issued in forty languages, to offer all prayers, works and sufferings throughout each day of the month for the reunion of divided Christendom. Was it the sight of the pilgrims from every land, gathered around their Chief Shepherd in this year of jubilee, that made the heart of the common Father of Christendom long still more for the return of the "other sheep," not yet of his Flock, and seek to win from Christ the graces by which alone the reunion of Christendom can be brought about?

A general desire of unity is visible among the scattered Christian sects as well as in this action of Pope Pius XI. The Lambeth Conference, the Geneva and Stockholm meetings and the great pan-Protestant gathering which is planned to take place at Washington are all indications of this desire of Christian unity which alone can bring a soul into a League of Nations. Outside the Catholic Church here in England one voice alone has struck the right note and indicated the only way in which the reunion of Christians can come about. Lord Halifax alone has raised his voice in a reasoned plea for Christ's way to unity—that of the acceptance of the prerogatives given to Peter and his successors by Christ as the means of holding His universal Church compact in the one faith of one visible Society. The others seek reunion on a Protestant basis of comprehensiveness, which is really doctrinal indifference. Lord Halifax pleads for reunion by the acceptance of the universal jurisdiction of the Pope over the whole Church, recognizing this as a divinely instituted prerogative of the Papacy and as part of the divinely planned constitution of the Church of Christ. I have nothing but praise for the way in which Lord Halifax states those arguments from Scripture, th

Fathers and Church History which prove the supremacy, that is, the universal jurisdiction of the Pope. With regard to his explanation of Infallibility I have some criticism to offer, and still further criticism of what I may call the practical advice to individual Anglicans which is to be gathered from the pamphlet taken as a whole.

The Malines Conversations seem to have borne this good fruit, that they have brought Lord Halifax into personal touch with the greatest Catholic historian of early Church history, Mgr. Batiffol; and Lord Halifax's plea for the Papal Supremacy gains much from his borrowing at times the very words of his argument from this distinguished theologian. A moderate theory of development of the Papacy is quite admissible by Roman theologians and it is by such a theory that agreement is most likely to be reached with Anglicans, if ever it comes to be reached.

#### LORD HALIFAX AND THE PAPAL SUPREMACY

Lord Halifax words his theory thus: "A primacy *jure divino* was implicit in the New Testament and the sub-apostolic age, and *explicit* at the Council of Chalcedon, a council which is one of the four specially referred to in Anglican formularies." I have no time to quote the pages from Lord Halifax's pamphlet which develop the proof of this thesis. A developed Papacy will satisfy Catholic theology, so long as no attempt is made to go back behind the Vatican Council to a less-developed stage in its evolution; for the development was guided by the Spirit of truth and is a true and normal growth, a healthy passing from childhood to maturity. Lord Halifax notes that "the authority of the Pope is not separate from that of the Episcopate; the authority of the Episcopate is not separate from that of the Pope; both authorities are *jure divino*." Just as, to use an army illustration, the authority of the commander-in-chief is not separate from that of the colonels who command regiments. Both authorities come from the source of all authority in the state, the King. And just as the colonels have real authority of office, though it has to be exercised with

subordination to the commander-in-chief, so the Bishops have real authority over defined dioceses, though they exercise that authority in subordination to the Pope who alone has universal jurisdiction over the whole Church. This Papal prerogative, as Lord Halifax rightly insists, is *jure divino*, unlike that of the Patriarchs whose office exists "*jure ecclesiastico*." The office of the latter was gradually built up by the Church and found to be a convenience in administration, and was intended to be a link in preserving unity. So much with regard to the Supremacy of the Pope. Here Lord Halifax's treatment is excellent; his plea will, please God, win from many sincere Anglo-Catholics the acceptance of the Pope's position as divinely appointed head of the Church.

#### LORD HALIFAX AND INFALLIBILITY

With regard to Infallibility, Lord Halifax is less satisfactory, less clear, and he seems not to accept the doctrine as it is expressed in the irreformable definition of the Vatican Council. He does not seem to admit the really personal character of the infallibility of St. Peter's successor. If the Pope's utterances were only reliable and irreformable when they announced the decision of a General Council over which he had presided, or if, in the event of his making a definition of doctrine apart from a General Council, it were necessary to wait and see if the Church consented to and accepted this definition before we could be certain of its truth, then it is hard to see how the Pope would be personally infallible or to see how in such cases the Successor of St. Peter could be said to "confirm his brethren." Would it not rather be a case of his brethren confirming the Pope—the General Council giving all its weight to his definition in the first case and the subsequent acceptance by the Church in the second? The Vatican's Decree definitely excludes this sense. Lord Halifax is mistaken when he declares that the phrase "*ex sese, non autem ex consensu ecclesiæ esse irreformabiles*" is not part of the definition. It follows in grammatical dependence on the solemn words "We teach and define." Certain confusion of thought may arise in speaking of the Pope "apart from" the Church. He never is "apart" from the living Body to which he is ever joined

in vital union as its divinely appointed Head. And as a matter of fact, the whole Church always will consent to or accept his teaching, for the rejection of the Pope's definition by any group or individuals would at once cut them off from the Church as heretics, as the "Old Catholics" were cut off by their refusal to accept the Vatican decrees.

#### CATHOLICISM WITHOUT THE POPE

I turn now to a part of Lord Halifax's pamphlet which seems to suggest that one can be a Catholic while out of communion with the Pope. He clearly does not believe that the acceptance of the Papal Supremacy carries with it the duty of abandoning the Anglican Church and becoming a convert to Rome. He would have those whom he persuades to accept the divine ruling authority of the Pope remain in the Anglican Communion in rebellion to that authority. His words, towards the end of the pamphlet, certainly imply if they do not indeed explicitly state this: his own example gives an authentic interpretation to his words. Lord Halifax says: "Lastly, has it not to be realized by Anglicans that the recognition of the claim of the Holy See to a primacy '*juro divino*' does not and cannot in itself involve, in the face of history and in view of the circumstances of the case, the abandonment of the Anglican Communion, or cancel the force of all other obligations." What does Lord Halifax mean by those words? Have they any message to his fellow-Anglicans today? Or would he say he was speaking to the last Anglicans who were left in the Church at the moment of its corporate submission and its conversion into a "uniate" Anglican Catholic Church in return for corporate submission to Rome at some future time—as Lord Halifax fondly hopes will happen some day. If he only means this I have no need to criticize his words today.

#### "CORPORATE REUNION"

"Corporate reunion" is not yet even a little cloud on the horizon, and Lord Halifax and the present generation will be dead and buried long before such a corporate act can possibly take place, if indeed it ever does take place. For my own part, I believe that never in its 350 years of history has the Establishment shown less readiness for any



corporate act of submission to the Pope by the acceptance of the whole of Catholic teaching. Modernism has taken firm root in Anglicanism and is flourishing, not with the feeble life and growth as of an exotic plant, but naturally, luxuriantly, rankles as a strong weed in the congenial soil of comprehensive Protestantism. There is nothing to stop its growth or uproot it, for excommunication for heresy is unthinkable in the Establishment of today and of the future. Modernists frankly avow their intention of working to secure the abolition of the rubric which makes the recitation of the Creed obligatory in the Anglican service. There is every chance of their succeeding in this aim at some future date. Again, Protestant Evangelicalism which hates the Pope and the Mass and rejects prayers to Our Lady and the Saints is still alive. It is not long since the "Call to Action" showed how Evangelicalism will ally itself even with Modernist unbelievers in its hatred of that measure of Catholic truth which is involved in Anglo-Catholicism. In the current number of the *Contemporary Review*, Bishop Knox declares:

"If the Church of England were to decide on accepting 'Catholic' teaching as its doctrine, great as our grief must be . . . we could no longer exercise our ministry in it." The vast majority of Anglican Bishops are more eager for and busier in striving to secure the reunion of Nonconformists with their Church than to bring their Church to the acceptance of the Papacy. Sir Robert Perks, speaking on behalf of Methodists, uttered the views of nearly all Nonconformists when he said apropos of the Malines Conversations: "I am convinced that there are few, if any, Methodists today who would desire any form of union whatever with the Church of England, if such union involved or paved the way for union with the Church of Rome," and the Anglican Episcopate are perfectly aware of this and have made their choice. No! We must face the plain fact that not only is a "Corporate reunion" of Anglicanism with the Pope not yet in sight, but present-day developments within the Church render it daily more impossible.

Malines has, perhaps, taught Lord Halifax that the Pope is "*jure divino*" Head of the Church of Christ, but he has come back from Malines still convinced that it is

possible to be Catholic while in schism from that Head. He still believes that the Anglican Church is—to use an old phrase—“a branch of the one true Church of Christ.” Neither Cardinal Mercier nor any continental Catholic theologian has approved this heresy. It is logically inconsistent with what Lord Halifax himself holds and teaches about the “*jure divino*” office of St. Peter and his successors. One step in reason is logically linked with this prerogative. If St. Peter and his line of successors are the “rock foundation” on which Christ has built His Church—a fact Lord Halifax admits—then no individual, no group, no local Church is part of Christ’s Visible Church unless it rest on that divinely laid foundation and owes its stability and unity of faith and loyal obedience to discipline to its being in communion with the Pope. It is not possible to be part of the Living Body of Christ if you are in no vital connection with its Head. How can you be “within” a house if you in no way are supported by its foundation? And Anglicans owe nothing to Peter, and the present chaotic condition of Anglicanism is due to its repudiation of the Pope and the consequent loss of all that Christ gives His Church through Peter’s successors.

#### ANGLO-CATHOLIC PRINCIPLES

On Anglo-Catholic principles, Anglicans who accept the Papal Primacy as divinely instituted should submit individually, since corporate submission is not at present under negotiation. Listen to these principles as Lord Halifax states them. They are the principles by which extreme Anglo-Catholics justify their departures from the “Prayer Book-and-Articles” religion of their Church. Lord Halifax says: “Local churches cannot set themselves up against the teaching of the Church Universal but must recognize its authority in matters of faith and practice as higher than their own. . . . It follows, therefore, in regard to the fact that the Anglican Episcopate is but a part, and a smaller part, of the whole Episcopate of the West, that where the teaching of the Episcopate in communion with Canterbury differs from that of Rome, some doubt at least must be cast upon what, on Anglican principles, is to be accepted as the teaching of the Church. No reference is here made to the Eastern Church, but the

statement holds good so far as the West is concerned, and we must remember that we are Westerns, not Easterns." If we bring in the East the authority in Anglican eyes is all the stronger. Now neither East nor West admits that the Anglican Established Church is part of the Catholic Church of Christ. Canterbury stands alone against the Bishops of the whole world in making this claim for herself. And everything depends on the truth of that claim. On "Anglican principles" it ought to be abandoned. To express the matter graphically; if a jury were collected by proportional representation of all the Episcopal Christians of the world, a jury consisting of sixteen members, fifteen to one is the verdict against accepting the Catholic status of the Anglican Church. The solitary voice raised for a verdict in favor of the Anglican claim is an Anglican voice! *Securus judicat orbis terrarum*. Yet Lord Halifax would have Anglicans cling loyally to their Church and even die in it out of communion with him whom he proves so conclusively to be the Head of Christ's Catholic Church on earth.

In the symposium of representatives of the three Anglican parties from which I have already quoted words of Bishop Knox are some words of the Anglo-Catholic representative, Dr. Goudge, which bear upon the Catholicity of Anglicanism. He says with truth: "Strictly speaking, it is not the individual who is or who can be Catholic, but the Church; and unless all members of the Church of England possess Catholic status, not one of them can do so." Thus, unless Bishop Barnes and Dean Inge and Dr. Major and the Bishop of Durham and Bishop Knox—the list might be extended indefinitely—are Catholics, Lord Halifax himself, a member of their Anglican communion, cannot be a Catholic. To apply the principle further: unless Ripon Hall, the nursing home of Modernism and an Anglican clergy school, is Catholic, then 'All Saints', Margaret-street, and St. Mary's, Graham street, and St. Saviour's, Hoxton, cannot be "Catholic" churches. If "Catholic fruits" seem to ripen in these churches, they do so because Catholic truths are imported from outside official Anglicanism and taught from the pulpits of the churches. Even when grafted on a Protestant stem, these truths bear the fruits of Catholic

virtue by God's uncovenanted graces and the working of God's Holy Spirit in sincere souls. Such "fruits" of grafted Catholic truths are no proof of the Catholicity of the Church in which they are found to grow and ripen only by violations of Anglican discipline and by contemptuous rejection of Anglican doctrinal formularies.

Is it our duty, in love of the souls of present-day Anglicans, to pray that these facts may come to be realized by an increasing number of converts year by year. May Lord Halifax's proofs of the Pope's right to the obedience of all the "other sheep" of Christ carry conviction, and by God's grace may those who admit the Pope's divinely granted power to command, be led to see that they have an immediate, urgent and individual duty to obey. "He that heareth you, heareth Me; he that despiseth you, despiseth Me" are words which, in an especial way, urge the duty of listening to Christ's Vicar on earth.

No waiting for a "Corporate reunion" will excuse the refusal of obedience to an authority which is recognized to be divinely instituted, nor will it justify a life spent deliberately out of communion with him who is recognized to be the Head of Christ's undivided and indivisible Body on Earth, His Catholic Church.

## **The Infallible Church**

REV. H. B. LOUGHNAN, S.J.

*Reprinted from the Melbourne "Tribune."*

**Y**OU will kindly notice how we are going to attack this all-important question. We shall base our proof upon the Scriptures. But notice we do not argue in this way:—The Scriptures are inspired by God; and these assert that the Church is infallible; and, therefore, we know, on the inspired word of God, that the Church is infallible. This would be what is called arguing in a circle; it would be proving Scriptural inspiration from Church infallibility, and Church infallibility from inspiration of Scripture. Let me illustrate this a little; for we thus answer in advance a common argument against our position. You have heard of Jose's History of Austra-

lasia. It would be absurd to say: Jose is a truthful historian, because the preface of the book vouches for this; and the preface is truthful, because it is written by Jose. This is false reasoning, and leads nowhere. Now, similarly, I do not say: The Church is infallible, because God, the Author of the Scriptures, says so; and God is the Author of the Scriptures, because the infallible Church says He is.

#### CREDIBILITY OF GOSPEL NARRATIVES

What we do say is this: Take up the New Testament as you would any other reliable document. For the moment do not say or think anything about its inspiration; for the time being treat the New Testament as a merely human piece of work. It has all the signs of being written by the authors whose names it bears; it shows all the signs of giving a true account of a Man, Jesus Christ, and the work of His followers. From a trustworthy Roman contemporary writer and from the diary of Julius Caesar, we gather, e.g., what were the ambitions, the character, the deeds and the death of Julius Caesar. We rely solely on the trustworthiness of the accounts handed down to us. So here; take the life of Jesus Christ as written by four men, the Evangelists; and other accounts of His teaching given by other writers of letters known as the Epistles: and the account of the early followers of the Apostles, known as the Acts of the Apostles. Judge these writings as you would those of any reliable contemporary pagan; compare their statements with these of other historians. You will find that these accounts of Christ have been, absolutely without question, accepted as being true history. This has been the verdict of men who saw and knew Jesus Christ; by men who lived just after Him and knew the story of His life and death and teaching; by generations who came after them. Attempts were made to pass off other Lives of Christ as the work of the Evangelists or of the Apostles; but at once these accounts were rejected as either unhistorical or as spurious or forged.

You cannot bear it too strongly in mind that in this lecture I am looking at the Gospels and the Acts of the Apostles and the Epistles, merely in so far as they are

genuine and authentic history. I do not rely on their being inspired (though, of course, they are). I examine them in no other way than I would the Annals of Tacitus or the Commentaries of Caesar. For my proof of the Church's Infallibility. I do not rely on the Scriptures being inspired. Hence I do not argue in a circle.

Roughly, the argument will run along these lines:—These reliable Lives of Christ tell us of a real man, who proved by a convincing test, that he was really God. This much has been put before you already in the lecture on the Divinity of Christ. Now, this Man-God founded a society, or a body of men joined together for a purpose; them He very carefully and very patiently taught, and much, though not all, of His teaching is found in the report of his conversations and public addresses and private teaching preserved in the New Testament. This teaching He regarded as of paramount importance—so much so, that to teach men was one of the reasons why God became Man. This society that Christ founded, was commissioned to spread His teaching throughout the world, not changing one jot or tittle of it, not adding, not subtracting; they might, indeed, draw conclusions from it, harmonize its various parts, seek proofs for doctrines that are capable of being proved by human reason, build it into a system of thought; but the while not change or add to it. To insure both that men would accept this teaching and that it might remain absolutely true, Christ, the God Who founded this teaching institution, promised He would use His divine power to safeguard it in its mission, and to prevent it from teaching error. Hence, this Church of Christ, of absolute necessity, must claim to be infallible.

#### LINKS IN CHAIN OF REASONING

These, then, are the links in our chain of reasoning:—First: Christ is truly God. This I take for granted. It is provable from the New Testament, even when this is used merely as a human document. Second: Christ revealed many truths of the supremest importance. This, too, I take for granted. Read the New Testament, and you will find them on every page. Third: Christ founded a society or institution, which we call a Church. This, again, I take for granted. Do we not often hear the re-

frain: "I shall build My Church," "Preach the Kingdom of God," etc., etc.? Fourth: He expressly commissioned this Church to teach, and to teach all men precisely what He had taught. This I shall have to prove. Fifth: He guaranteed that till the end of time, this society or Church would not fail in its mission of teaching the truth which He had revealed to it; that He Himself guaranteed the correct handing on of His doctrines; so much so, that when this Church should tell us a doctrine was revealed, we should be under exactly the same obligation of believing it, as we would be if we heard it from the lips of Christ, instead of through the medium of those who gave us the truths which He originally revealed. This divine guarantee I shall have to prove. If, then, the arguments alleged have convincing force, then you will admit that the true Church of Christ must claim to be infallible.

Let us now establish our position. In the first place, why do we assert that Christ Our Lord imposed upon the Society which He founded, the strictest obligation to teach what He taught? Because He expressly gives them this order, "Going therefore, teach ye all nations. . . . teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you." (Matt, 28, 19.) Earlier in His life, He "appointed twelve that they might be with Him, and that He might send them to preach," and He thus authorizes their mission, "He gave them power to heal sickness and to cast out devils." (Mark iii, 14, 15.) Clearly, they are to teach with authority, that is to say, men will be morally obliged to listen to and accept their teaching; for He imposes the heaviest penalties for rejection of their message. "Go ye into the whole world and preach the Gospel to every creature. . . . He that believeth not shall be condemned." (Mark 16, 16.)

#### THE APOSTLES INFALLIBLE TEACHERS OF DOCTRINE

This much then, is clear and easy to grasp. Christ commanded His twelve apostles to teach what He taught. It was His last commandment recorded by St. Mark and the closing words recorded by St. Matthew.

In the next place, did Christ Our Lord make these Apostles, and St. Paul later, infallible teachers of His doctrine? Was their doctrine so guaranteed, that those

who heard it were able to believe not merely that it was true, but was the truth which God Himself had revealed? And we answer unhesitatingly: Yes. And the reasons for this answer are these:—The God-Man Jesus Christ made this promise to them: He gave them this guarantee of teaching in His name only truth.

For note the words used, when He commanded them to preach His doctrine to the whole world. Just before His Ascension He says, "All power is given to Me in heaven and on earth. Going therefore, teach ye all nations . . . teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you, and behold, I am with you."

#### MEANING AND FORCE OF COMMISSION

Now, I shall ask you to examine carefully, and in some detail, the meaning and force of this expression, and then its bearing on the mission entrusted to the apostles. Clearly, we must take it to mean what it ordinarily meant at that day, in the language and country of the speaker and what the Apostles were accustomed to understand by it. The phrase, "I am with you," occurs nearly a hundred times in the Old and the New Testament, and it retains everywhere one fixed and well-defined meaning. It always implies on the part of God, a particular providence, a special watchful care of persons and their interests, so that they shall unfailingly succeed in the undertakings to which He refers. It is a guarantee given by God of success. Thus we read in Genesis that God said to Isaac: "Dwell in the land which I shall tell thee of. . . . And I will be with thee, and will bless thee" (Gen. 26, 3). So, too, in Isaiah God thus comforts Israel: "Fear not, for thou art Mine. When thou shalt pass through the waters I shall be with thee and the rivers shall not cover thee. When thou shalt walk in the fire thou shalt not be harmed. . . . Fear not, for I am with thee" (Is. 42, 2). So too in the New Testament, when Nicodemus came to Jesus . . . he said to Him: "Master, we know Thou art come a teacher from God; for no man can do these signs thou dost, unless God be with Him" (Jn. 3, 2). St. Peter, too, takes it for granted that even non-Jews are familiar with the expression and its significance. Of Jesus Christ, he says: ". . . He went about doing



good and healing all that were oppressed by the devil: for God was with Him" (Acts. 10, 38). And when St. Paul was in danger from the Jews of Corinth, the Lord said to him: "Do not fear, but speak and hold not thy peace, because I am with thee, and no man shall hurt thee" (Acts 18, 9). But notice other places where the phrase is used as an express guarantee of success: Moses protested that he was unable to free the Israelites from Pharo and bring them out of Egypt; God replied, "I will be with thee" (Ex. 3, 3). In the same sense is the phrase used in the Book of Judges (6, 15): Gideon mistrusted his ability "to deliver Israel out of the hand of Madian." The Lord said to him: "I will be with thee: and thou shalt cut off Madian as one man." Nothing, then, can be more certain than this: In Scripture, the promise, "I am with you" is a guarantee of complete success in the mission entrusted to one.

Now, apply this to the words of Christ which we are considering. "All power is given to Me in heaven and on earth: going therefore, teach ye all nations, teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you; and behold (a very solemn introduction) I am with you." May we not most reasonably and most cogently argue thus:—Christ reminds them of His limitless divine power in heaven as well as on earth; then He guarantees that this power will ensure the complete success of their mission, which was to teach His doctrine; therefore, we have His divine guarantee that they will not fail.

#### GUARANTEE OF SUCCESS NECESSITATES INFALLIBILITY

But you will naturally ask:—Does this guarantee of success in teaching His doctrine, necessitate infallibility? Again, we say, Yes. For consider what would happen if these teachers were liable to occasional mistakes, or could suffer a few, even if very rare, lapses. If one single error had once been taught, never again could the teacher claim to speak with absolute certainty of being true. It could always be said: He erred once; there is nothing to show that he may not be doing so again. I think that this is perfectly sound and reasonable. To put it in another light: If the Apostles were not beyond the possibility of teaching falsehood, even in a single instance, they could never

with justice demand full acceptance of all their teaching under penalty of eternal damnation.

Hence it seems fair and just and not unduly straining the words which Christ used, to say that He guaranteed the absolute truth of the message which His Apostles would deliver; for He promised that since all power in heaven and on earth was His, He would be with them in their mission of teaching all things that He commanded.

#### APOSTLES CONSCIOUS OF DIVINE GUIDANCE

Now, as the infallibility of the Apostles is of the utmost importance, let us see another reason for our holding that they had this gift. It is this: They themselves were convinced beyond any manner of doubt, that their message was that of God: that their hearers had the same reason for believing this message, as they would have had if they heard this truth from the lips of Christ Himself, namely, that it was God's teaching. Let us see that the Apostles did believe that they had this privilege of speaking with the authority of God. In the first place, recall St. Paul's thanksgiving for the Thessalonians, "Because that when you had received from us the word of the hearing, you received it not as the word of man, but (as it is indeed) the word of God" (I. Thess. 2, 13). He had previously remarked, "We are approved by God that the Gospel should be committed to us." And again, notice the strong claim made by the Apostles when speaking in their corporate capacity:—"It hath seemed good to the Holy Ghost and to us," they write from the Council at Jerusalem to the Churches at Antioch and Syria and Cilicia. True, the question at issue at first sight seems merely a disciplinary one, namely, Are the early Christians who are not Jews, to be bound by the laws of the synagogue? But, at the back of this question there was the very important dogmatic one, were Christians according to Christ's teaching, to observe the Old Law in its integrity? The Apostles decided that they were not; and when giving this decision they claimed to speak in the name of and by the authority of the Holy Ghost. "It hath seemed good to the Holy Ghost and to us." Would men who did not believe that Christ's promises assured them of an infallible divine guidance have dared to speak in this manner? As a final

sample of many such claims to speak God's revealed truth with unerring certainty, we cite St. Paul's First Epistle to the Corinthians. He commends his teaching on virginity by the impressive words, "And I think that I also have the spirit of God" (6, 40), and a little later he contrasts his teaching with that of those who have only human authority; for he tells them that he has spoken to them "in the doctrine of the Spirit," for, as he adds, "We have the mind of Christ."

Hence there seems no doubt about the Apostles being conscious of the divine guidance that was theirs. And we must take them to be correct and not under a delusion. For it would be more than difficult to suppose that His intimate friends misunderstood Him, though for three years they had been specially prepared and instructed by Christ, and—as we have seen—were explicitly promised this divine guidance in their teaching: "I am with you."

#### GIFT OF INFALLIBILITY SURVIVES WITH SUCCESSORS OF APOSTLES

Now, let us pause for a moment and see where we stand. We have shown that Christ commissioned His Apostles to teach; in the next place, that He guaranteed the truth of their exposition of revealed doctrine. That is to say, we have shown that the teaching Church at the time of its foundation, received the gift which we call infallibility. Now we take an important step further. Did this gift perish with the Apostles, or does it instead, survive today with the successors of the Apostles? We shall now discuss this point and thus round off our proof for the claim made by the Church to be at present infallible.

In the first place, apart from proof, every likelihood and probability favors the Church's claim. Christ safeguards the revelation given to the Apostles, by making them its unerring exponents, as we have just shown. The Apostles pass away; their place is filled by other accredited teachers, not formed personally by Christ; the Christian revelation must be announced until the consummation of the world, as He Himself most expressly stated; the penalty for the non-acceptance of it remains unaltered; the danger of error of adulteration grows, as one generation succeeds another. Can we then believe that Christ withdraws the

safeguard which He gave in the beginning, just when the need for it becomes more pressing? Every probability points the other way. For it was a privilege conferred on them, not for their own advantage, but for the advantage of those whom they were to teach; it was attached to the teaching office which they were to fill. We might well conclude, that as long as the teaching office continues in the Church, as long as men are bound to accept the teaching, so long will that teaching remain infallible.

#### REASONABLENESS OF CLAIM

It is well to emphasize this. Because we then see that the claim to be here and now infallible is reasonable, and not far-fetched or arrogant or presumptuous. In fact, along the lines which I have just indicated, one could show the infallibility of the present teaching Church, without adducing any other proof from the New Testament. But let us now see that we have in point of fact, an explicit promise of Christ Our Lord—in fact two—that His Church would be divinely safeguarded from the possibility of error, even to the end of the world, in other words, that the True Church of Christ, wherever and whatever it is, might be infallible.

Examine once more the words in which the Master pledged Himself to guard the Apostles from all doctrinal error in the preaching of the Gospel. "Going therefore, teach . . . and behold I am with you, with you all days even to the consummation of the world." Let these words ring in your mind for a while, "To the consummation, or end, of the world." They have a very definite and a very obvious meaning; they are not ambiguous; they are not metaphorical; nor have they a technical sense, other than their obvious meaning. They simply assert "to the end of the world." The divine guarantee "I am with you," is therefore given to last to the end of the world. Therefore, He is addressing and making promise to not only the Apostles who were then His audience, but also to their accredited successors in the teaching office. Why? Because, else the words are childish and meaningless; in the same breath, He would be promising His divine guidance until the end of the world, while limiting it to the lifetime of the Apostles!